REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The following remarks attend to all outstanding issues in the non-final Office Action mailed October 20, 2004. The Application presented claims 25-38 for examination. The present response cancels claims 25-38 and presents new claims 39-50. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the new claims in view of the following remarks.

By action taken here, Applicants in no way intend to surrender any range of equivalents beyond that needed to patentably distinguish the claimed invention as a whole over the prior art. Applicants expressly reserve all such equivalents that may fall in the range between Applicants' literal claim recitations and combinations taught or suggested by the prior art.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 25-38 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-31 of co-pending Application No. 09/558,922. Applicants respectfully traverse the provisional rejection. Nevertheless, claims 12-31 are canceled by the above amendment. According, Applicants respectfully submit the provisional double patenting rejection is moot.

The Examiner's attention is directed to co-pending applications bearing serial number 09/558,924 and 09/558,925, which were filed on the same day and which Applicants provided in an Information Disclosure Statement herewith, in addition to 09/558,922. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner investigate possible double patenting issues with respect to the aforementioned applications.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 12-13 and 17-31 as being unpatentable over DASAN (US 5,761,662), and FURST (US 6,297,819), and claims 14-16 as being unpatentable over DASAN, FURST and further in view of CRAGUN (US 6,161,112). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Nevertheless, the Applicants have canceled claims 11-31 in favor of

-6-

claims 32-48. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C.
§ 103(a) are now moot.

New claims 39-50

Since the inception of the World Wide Web, standard Internet content (such as Web
pages written in HTML, JavaScript) has always been rendered by and presented through a Web
browser program (e.g., Microsoft® Internet Explorer®). It is interesting to note that all Web
browser programs available in the market place share a common feature: Web browser programs
display Internet content through a "window frame-like" user interface with buttons like
"Forward," "Backward," "Home," etc. A user of a Web browser program is given some
flexibility in configuring the "window frame." For instance, the user may change the size of the
window frame, or remove some buttons. The browser vendor (e.g., Microsoft Corporation) also
has some control over the appearance of the "window frame," such as the appearance of the
"home" icon, and the branding of the browser.

None of those Web browser programs, however, enables Web content providers (e.g., the
author of a Web page) to control the functionality or appearance of the "window frame" of the
Web browser program.

The invention provides a software platform through which Web content designers can
present Internet content (e.g., data programmed in a format readable by a Web browser program,
Web pages written in HTML, XML, JavaScript) together with a user interface (e.g., a frame that
surrounds the content data) that the Web content providers may have some control over. In other
words, the invention enables a Web content provider to define the content to be presented and
the functionality of the user interface through which the content is presented.

In one specific embodiment, the client-side program provides a "HomeDot" or a "Home
NIM" that acts as a command center, listing the available "Dots" or "NIMs" in a menu format
and allowing a user to select specific "Dots" or "NIMs". An example "Home NIM" 162 is
illustrated in FIG. 5 of the instant application. A user of the client-side program may choose any
one of the listed items (called "Dots" or "NIMs"). If a user chooses the "AnyDay Calendar"

item from the list 188 (FIG. 5), the display of "AnyDay Calendar Dot" 103 (FIG. 6) will result. As another example, if a user chooses the "Work.com Business Search" item from the list 188, the display of a search engine "Dot" 133-4 (FIG. 9B) will result. Note that the "AnyDay Calendar Dot" and the search engine "Dot" 133-4 are displayed *outside* of a Web browser user interface. (Note that the "frame" around the "Dot" does not have any control buttons typically associated with a Web browser program). The code that defines the user interface for the "Dot" (e.g., frames of the "AnyDay Calendar Dot" and the search engine "Dot") is Internet content as well. Thus, the Web content provider may control the appearance and functionality of the user interface as well as the content with which the user interface is presented.

Independent claim 39 includes the limitation of "displaying information outside of a window of a Web browser program through a user interface of which functionality and appearance is defined at least in part by data that is programmed in a format readable by a Web browser program." It is submitted the cited references do not teach this limitation.

Independent claim 44 includes the limitations:

> computer readable instructions for causing the computer device to display, in response to selection of one of the user selectable items, information outside of a window of a Web browser program;

> computer readable instructions for causing the computer device to provide a user interface for the information, wherein functionality and appearance of the user interface is defined at least in part by data that is programmed in a format readable by a Web browser program.

It is submitted the cited references do not teach these limitations.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the references do not teach or suggest the specific systems and methods as claimed. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>April 19, 2005</u>

<u>41,923</u>

Wilfred Lam   (Reg. No.)

Innovation Management Sciences
970 Terra Bella Avenue, Suite 8
Mountain View, California 94043
(650) 969-8300

Enclosure